UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------|
| 10/581,516 | 12/13/2006 | Paola Lavermicocca | 13758/1 | 9481 |
| 26646 KENYON & K | 7590 12/17/200 ENYON LLP | EXAMINER | | |
| ONE BROADV | VAY | | MACAULEY, SHERIDAN R | |
| NEW YORK, N | NY 10004 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1651 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 12/17/2009 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | | Applicant(s) | |
|-----------------|------------|---------------------|--|
| | 10/581,516 | LAVERMICOCCA ET AL. | |
| | | | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |

| | SHERIDAN R. MACAULEY | 1651 | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence add | ress | | | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>09 December 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appel for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods: | the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavited eal (with appeal fee) in compliance v | Appeal. To avoid abar ., or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or | hich places the (3) a Request | | | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to | dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth i ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing | date of the final rejection | n. | | | | | | |
| Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | f). on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1. cension and the corresponding amount of chortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date | 36(a) and the appropriat of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic | e extension fee ate extension fee e action; or (2) as | | | | | | |
| NOTICE OF APPEAL | | | | | | | | | |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>09 December 2009</u>. A the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), a appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply AMENDMENTS | or any extension thereof (37 CFR 4 | 1.37(e)), to avoid disr | nissal of the | | | | | | |
| 3. 🛛 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, l | out prior to the date of filing a brief, | will not be entered be | cause | | | | | | |
| (a) They raise new issues that would require further con | | | | | | | | | |
| (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo | w); | | | | | | | | |
| (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or | ter form for appeal by materially red | lucing or simplifying th | ne issues for | | | | | | |
| (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a d | corresponding number of finally reje | cted claims. | | | | | | | |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. $oxedsymbol{oxed}$ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 | 21. See attached Notice of Non-Cor | mpliant Amendment (I | PTOL-324). | | | | | | |
| 5. \square Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | <u> </u> | | | | | | | | |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). | | • | - | | | | | | |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1 and 5. | | be entered and an ex | xplanation of | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected. <u>I and 3.</u> Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>2-4,6 and 7.</u> | | | | | | | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea | l and/or appellant fails | s to provide a | | | | | | |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | n of the status of the claims after er | ntry is below or attach | ed. | | | | | | |
| 11. X The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet. | t does NOT place the application in | condition for allowan | ce because: | | | | | | |
| 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). | PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) | | | | | | | | |
| 13. Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> | | | | | | | | | |
| | /Ruth A. Davis/ | | | | | | | | |
| | Primary Examiner, Art U | nit 1651 | | | | | | | |
| | , | | | | | | | | |

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments have been considered but they have not been found to be persuasive because they are directed to claim amendments that have not been entered because they would require further search and/or consideration.

Continuation of 13. Other: The proposed amendments will not be entered because they raise new issues that would require further search and/or consideration. For instance, the amendments include the new claim limitation that the olives contain microorganisms adhering to the pericarp "in an amount of 1 x 1,000,000 or higher per gram of olive". This limitation was not included in the previously examined claims and would require further search and/or consideration.